

**LATHAM & WATKINS LLP**  
Andrew M. Gass (Bar No. 259694)  
*andrew.gass@lw.com*  
Joseph R. Wetzel (Bar No. 238008)  
*joe.wetzel@lw.com*  
505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
(415) 391-0600

Allison L. Stillman (*pro hac vice*)  
*alli.stillman@lw.com*  
1271 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10020  
(212) 906-1200

*Attorneys for Defendants Internet Archive, Brewster Kahle, Kahle/Austin Foundation, George Blood, and George Blood L.P.*

*Additional counsel listed on signature page.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

UMG RECORDINGS, INC., CAPITOL RECORDS, LLC, CONCORD BICYCLE ASSETS, LLC, CMGI RECORDED MUSIC ASSETS LLC, SONY MUSIC ENTERTAINMENT, and ARISTA MUSIC,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

INTERNET ARCHIVE, BREWSTER  
KAHLE, KAHLE/AUSTIN FOUNDATION,  
GEORGE BLOOD, and GEORGE BLOOD  
L.P.

### *Defendants.*

Case No. 3:23-cv-06522-MMC

**DEFENDANTS INTERNET ARCHIVE,  
KAHLE, KAHLE/AUSTIN FOUNDATION,  
BLOOD, AND GEORGE BLOOD L.P.'S  
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION  
TO COMPEL DISCOVERY**

Date: December 19, 2024  
Time: 9:30 a.m.  
Place: Courtroom B, 15th Floor  
Judge: Hon. Laurel Beeler

1  
2                   **TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
3

	<b>Page</b>
1                   TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
2                   I.       INTRODUCTION .....	1
3                   II.      BACKGROUND .....	2
4                   A.      FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	2
5                   B.      PROCEDURAL HISTORY.....	4
6                   III.     LEGAL STANDARD.....	5
7                   IV.      ARGUMENT .....	6
8                   A.      PLAINTIFFS FAIL TO JUSTIFY DISCLOSURE OF KAHLE 9                   AND BLOOD'S PRIVATE AND HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL 10                  FINANCIAL INFORMATION .....	6
11                  B.      PLAINTIFFS' REQUEST FOR GENERAL STATEMENTS 12                  ABOUT COPYRIGHT LAW SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE 13                  IT IS OVERBROAD AND SUCH STATEMENTS ARE 14                  IRRELEVANT .....	9
15                  C.      PLAINTIFFS' REQUEST FOR ALL DIGITIZED SOUND 16                  RECORDINGS SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT IS 17                  OVERBROAD AND UNTETHERED TO THE SCOPE OF THE 18                  ALLEGED INFRINGEMENT AT ISSUE HERE .....	11
19                  D.      PLAINTIFFS' REQUEST ABOUT UNLOCKED RECORDINGS 20                  IS MERITLESS AND AT BEST PREMATURE .....	13
21                  V.      CONCLUSION.....	15
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES  
2  
3

Page(s)

4 CASES  
5  
6

7	<i>Beautiful Slides, Inc. v. Allen,</i> 8 2017 WL 11664920 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 15, 2017).....	6, 7
9	<i>Cook v. Meta Platforms, Inc.,</i> 10 2024 WL 1483992 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 5, 2024) .....	10
11	<i>EFT Holdings, Inc. v. CTX Virtual Techs., Inc.,</i> 12 2016 WL 11519280 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 3, 2016).....	8
13	<i>Epidemic Sound AB v. Meta Platforms, Inc.,</i> 14 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 185597 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 10, 2024).....	12
15	<i>Feist Publ'ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co.,</i> 16 499 U.S. 340 (1991).....	11
17	<i>Fleck &amp; Assocs., Inc. v. Phoenix,</i> 18 471 F.3d 1100 (9th Cir. 2006) .....	8
19	<i>Hudson Martin Ferrante Street Witten &amp; Demaria, PC v. Forsythe,</i> 20 2017 WL 550242 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 10, 2017) .....	10
21	<i>Jones v. Amicizia Events, Inc.,</i> 22 2020 WL 6065927 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2020) .....	9
23	<i>La. Pac. Corp. v. Money Mkt. I Institutional Inv. Dealer,</i> 24 285 F.R.D. 481 (N.D. Cal. 2012).....	5
25	<i>Laub v. U.S. Dep't of Interior,</i> 26 342 F.3d 1080 (9th Cir. 2003) .....	5
27	<i>Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Network Sols.,</i> 28 194 F.3d 980 (9th Cir. 1999) .....	13
29	<i>Palacios v. Ameriwood Indus., Inc.,</i> 30 2015 WL 7852167 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 4, 2015) .....	7
31	<i>Premium Serv. Corp. v. Sperry &amp; Hutchinson Co.,</i> 32 511 F.2d 225 (9th Cir. 1975) .....	7
33	<i>Psihoyos v. Pearson Educ., Inc.,</i> 34 2010 WL 11889066 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 7, 2010) .....	12
35	<i>RePet, Inc. v. Zhao,</i> 36 2016 WL 11634744 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 3, 2016).....	6

1	<i>Richmond v. Mission Bank,</i> 2015 WL 1637835 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 13, 2015).....	6
2		
3	<i>S.F. Bay Area Rapid Transit Dist. v. Spencer,</i> 2006 WL 3050860 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 23, 2006).....	7
4		
5	<i>Saca v. J.P. Molyneux Studio Ltd.,</i> 2008 WL 62181 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 4, 2008) .....	8
6		
7	<i>Slate v. Am. Broad. Cos.,</i> 274 F.R.D. 350 (D.D.C. 2011).....	12
8		
9	<i>Soto v. City of Concord,</i> 162 F.R.D. 603 (N.D. Cal. 1995).....	5
10		
11	<i>Teradyne, Inc. v. Astronics Test Sys., Inc.,</i> 2022 WL 18397125 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2022) .....	12
12		

## STATUTES

12	17 U.S.C.	
13	§ 108(h).....	7
14	§ 504(c)(2) .....	7
15	§ 507(b).....	7
16	§§ 901–14.....	9
17		
18	Copyright Act.....	4, 9
19		

## RULES

17	Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 .....	12
18		
19	Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1).....	5
20		
21	Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2).....	11
22		
23	Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(C) .....	5
24		
25	Fed. R. Evid. 401 .....	5
26		

## CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

24	Cal. Const. art. I, § 1 .....	6
25		

## OTHER AUTHORITIES

26	<i>About Collections</i> , The Great 78 Project, <a href="https://great78.archive.org/about/">https://great78.archive.org/about/</a> (last visited Nov. 20, 2024).....	3
27		
28	<i>About the Internet Archive</i> , Internet Archive, <a href="https://archive.org/about/">https://archive.org/about/</a> (last visited Nov. 20, 2024).....	2
29		

1	Amanda Petrusich, <i>Do Not Sell At Any Price</i> (2014) .....	2
2	Amanda Petrusich, <i>They've Got Those Old, Hard-to-Find Blues</i> , N.Y. Times (July 8, 2009) .....	3
4	Chris Freeland, <i>Internet Archive Services Update: 2024-10-21</i> , Internet Archive (Oct. 21, 2024), <a href="https://blog.archive.org/2024/10/21/internet-archive-services-update-2024-10-21/">https://blog.archive.org/2024/10/21/internet-archive-services-update-2024-10-21/</a> .....	14
6	Daniel Wu, <i>The World's Largest Internet Archive Is Under Siege—And Fighting Back</i> , Wash. Post (Oct. 18, 2024) .....	14
8	<i>The Great 78 Project: Preservation</i> , Internet Archive, <a href="https://great78.archive.org/preservation/">https://great78.archive.org/preservation/</a> (last visited Nov. 20, 2024).....	3
9	Kelsey Kennedy, <i>A Wayback Machine for Early 20th Century Tunes</i> , Atlas Obscura (May 4, 2017), <a href="https://www.atlasobscura.com/articles/internet-archive-78-records-phonograph">https://www.atlasobscura.com/articles/internet-archive-78-records-phonograph</a> .....	3
11	Pekka Gronow, <i>The World's Greatest Sound Archive: 78 RPM Records as a Source for Musicological Research</i> , 43 Traditiones 31, 32 (2014) .....	2, 3
13	Tom Warren, <i>The Internet Archive Is Back as a Read-Only Service After Cyberattacks</i> , Verge (Oct. 14, 2024), <a href="https://www.theverge.com/2024/10/14/24269741/internet-archive-online-read-only-data-breach-outage">https://www.theverge.com/2024/10/14/24269741/internet-archive-online-read-only-data-breach-outage</a> .....	14
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1       **I. INTRODUCTION**

2                  This case is about Defendants' efforts to preserve a fast-disappearing piece of American  
 3 cultural history—the way that human beings listened to recorded sound for the first half-century  
 4 of that technology's existence. Specifically, this case is about an effort by Defendants and their  
 5 partners, known as the "Great 78 Project," to preserve and digitize 78 revolution-per-minute  
 6 ("rpm") records for researchers, educators, scholars, and future generations. Plaintiffs—a  
 7 collection of record labels—sued Defendants claiming that Defendants' process of digitizing  
 8 sound recordings contained on 78 rpm shellac records and uploading those recordings to the Great  
 9 78 Project's website for streaming and downloading by patrons infringes Plaintiffs' copyrights.

10                 This case has had an extended procedural history. It was filed a little more than a year ago  
 11 in the Southern District of New York, and the onset of discovery was postponed while the parties  
 12 briefed a motion to transfer venue in New York last fall, and then by Plaintiffs' amendment of  
 13 their pleading and the parties' briefing of motions to dismiss this past spring, and finally by  
 14 preparation for and attendance at a mediation that took place in late September. Since that  
 15 mediation concluded, however, discovery has been proceeding apace. Defendants collectively  
 16 have made multiple productions totaling thousands of documents and over ten thousand pages,  
 17 with additional productions to proceed on a rolling basis.

18                 Unsatisfied, Plaintiffs have now filed a motion to compel ("Mot."). Their motion seeks  
 19 production of evidence and responses in four categories: (1) Defendants Brewster Kahle and  
 20 George Blood's financial information, (2) "all" of Defendants Internet Archive and George Blood  
 21 L.P. ("GBLP")'s statements regarding "copyright" and the "Copyright Act," (3) "all" of the 78  
 22 rpm sound recordings that Defendant Internet Archive digitized as part of the Great 78 Project,  
 23 even those that it does not offer publicly for streaming or downloading, and (4) a supplemental  
 24 response from Internet Archive regarding the "Unlocked Recordings" section of Internet Archive's  
 25 website. But Plaintiffs' motion is meritless. They have failed to meet their burden to demonstrate  
 26 that they are entitled to relief on any of these categories, because the information they seek is  
 27 overbroad, disproportionate, and irrelevant. Or at a minimum, Plaintiffs' motion is woefully  
 28 premature at this juncture. Their motion should be denied.

1       **II. BACKGROUND**

2       **A. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

3           The Internet Archive is a not-for-profit research library founded by Brewster Kahle in  
 4           1996. ECF No. 95 (“Compl.”) ¶¶ 29, 47. The organization is perhaps best known for its “Wayback  
 5           Machine,” which has archived billions of web pages going back 26 years, and—as the primary  
 6           source of historical records of prior versions of the internet—provides free access to these  
 7           historical materials for researchers, academics, and the public. *See About the Internet Archive,*  
 8           Internet Archive, <https://archive.org/about/> (last visited Nov. 20, 2024). Beyond the Wayback  
 9           Machine, the Internet Archive works to catalog, preserve, and provide public access to a wide  
 10          variety of other materials of significant cultural and historical importance. *Id.* One of these  
 11          archival initiatives is the “Great 78 Project,” which works to collect, preserve, and digitize 78 rpm  
 12          music records. Compl. ¶ 48.

13           “The 78 rpm record was introduced in the 1890s, about ten years after Thomas Edison  
 14          developed his phonograph machine and revolutionized the ways human beings thought about  
 15          sound.” Amanda Petrusich, *Do Not Sell At Any Price* 10 (2014) (hereinafter “Petrusich”). Made  
 16          out of a brittle shellac resin material, rather than the vinyl that is used for records today, “78s”  
 17          became “the standard format of sound recordings” throughout “the first half of the twentieth  
 18          century,” and “at least a million titles had been issued by various record companies around the  
 19          world” in the 78 rpm format by the late 1950s. Pekka Gronow, *The World’s Greatest Sound*  
 20          Archive: 78 RPM Records as a Source for Musicological Research, 43 *Traditiones* 31, 32 (2014).  
 21          By the 1960s, however, 78 rpm records fell out of favor, and were “gradually replaced by” newer,  
 22          lower-speed formats, like “seven-inch, two-song 45s and twelve-inch, long-playing 33 $\frac{1}{3}$  records.”  
 23          Petrusich, *supra*, at 10.

24           Because of the materials used to produce 78 rpm records, and the technology and method  
 25          used to record the music onto the records, the sound of a 78 rpm record differs significantly from  
 26          the music that listeners are accustomed to hearing on digital streaming services like Spotify or  
 27          Apple Music, compact discs, or even vinyl records. “Depending on the quality of the [78 rpm]  
 28          recording and the condition of the disc, there’s often a high and persistent background hiss” or the

1 sound “might be fully obscured by a staticky sizzle.” *Id.* at 17. Preserving these records as they  
 2 would have been heard and experienced by listeners at the time they were made approximately  
 3 one hundred years ago is a critically important part of archiving these works. Despite their  
 4 popularity throughout the first half of the twentieth century, 78 rpm records are a uniquely “finite  
 5 resource.” *Id.* at 4. Because of the materials used for their manufacture, they “are thick, brittle,  
 6 and heavy,” *id.* at 14, and yet “are remarkably fragile,” *id.* at 4. Many 78 rpm records were  
 7 “produced in very limited quantities.” *Id.* And the music of some of most popular artists of the  
 8 early twentieth century “can only be found on rare 78s” today. Kelsey Kennedy, *A Wayback*  
 9 *Machine for Early 20th Century Tunes*, Atlas Obscura (May 4, 2017),  
 10 <https://www.atlasobscura.com/articles/internet-archive-78-records-phonograph>. For these  
 11 reasons, “[t]he stakes are . . . high from a preservationist standpoint” for continued access to the  
 12 unique sound of 78 rpm records. Amanda Petrusich, *They’ve Got Those Old, Hard-to-Find Blues*,  
 13 N.Y. Times (July 8, 2009), <https://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/12/arts/music/12petr.html>.

14 In recognition of the importance of 78 rpm records to our shared cultural heritage, the  
 15 Internet Archive and its partners launched the Great 78 Project over six years ago to collect,  
 16 preserve, and digitize the unique sounds embodied in 78 rpm records for the benefit of researchers,  
 17 historians, members of the public, and future generations. *See Compl. ¶¶ 48–49; The Great 78*  
 18 *Project*, Internet Archive, <https://great78.archive.org/> (last visited Nov. 20, 2024). The Internet  
 19 Archive and the Great 78 Project partnered with GBLP for professional digitization of 78 rpm  
 20 records donated to the Great 78 Project by collectors and libraries. *See Compl. ¶¶ 12, 48–49.*  
 21 These collections include works donated, for example, by the Archive of Contemporary Music,  
 22 the Boston Public Library Sound Archive, universities, and individual collectors. *See About*  
 23 *Collections*, The Great 78 Project, <https://great78.archive.org/about/> (last visited Nov. 20, 2024).  
 24 After the records have been painstakingly digitally archived, the physical records are stored for  
 25 long-term preservation, and the digital versions of the recordings are uploaded to the Great 78  
 26 Project’s website by the Internet Archive, where they can be accessed by researchers, historians,  
 27 and members of the public to listen to online. *See The Great 78 Project: Preservation*, Internet  
 28 Archive, <https://great78.archive.org/preservation/> (last visited Nov. 20, 2024); Compl. ¶¶ 48–49.

1                   **B. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

2                   On July 22, 2020—years after the Great 78 Project had been established and generated  
 3 significant industry attention—the Recording Industry Association of America (“RIAA”), a trade  
 4 association representing record labels and other members of the recording industry, including most  
 5 of the Plaintiffs, wrote to the Internet Archive asserting that the Great 78 Project had infringed its  
 6 members’ copyrights by digitizing and making certain works available for streaming on the  
 7 internet. Compl. ¶ 80. The Internet Archive responded, offering to discuss removal of specific  
 8 works with the RIAA and its members to the extent that there are “particular recordings” that the  
 9 members could identify. Compl. ¶ 81. *The RIAA and its members never responded.*

10                  More than three years after the RIAA’s letter, Plaintiffs filed this lawsuit on August 11,  
 11 2023, in the Southern District of New York. *See generally* ECF No. 1. Plaintiffs are six record  
 12 labels—Sony Music Entertainment, Arista Music, UMG Recordings, Capitol Records, Concord  
 13 Bicycle Assets, and CMGI Recorded Music Assets. Compl. ¶¶ 21–27. Plaintiffs allege that they  
 14 “own and/or control in whole or in part the exclusive rights in innumerable sound recordings” that  
 15 have been “infringed by Defendants through the Great 78 Project.” Compl. ¶ 28. Plaintiffs do not  
 16 specify exactly what rights they own as to each asserted sound recording. Given the age of most  
 17 of the recordings preserved by the Great 78 Project, Plaintiffs’ claims depend on tracing the chain  
 18 of title of their alleged copyrights as far back as the turn of the twentieth century (or earlier). Cf.  
 19 ECF No. 95-1 (table of alleged sound recordings at issue). Plaintiffs assert claims for direct  
 20 infringement, contributory infringement, and vicarious infringement under the Copyright Act. *See*  
 21 Compl. ¶¶ 94–198.

22                  This case has had a significant procedural history. First, the parties briefed a motion to  
 23 transfer the case from New York to California, which was ultimately granted. ECF No. 59. And  
 24 after the case was transferred to California at the end of 2023, Plaintiffs amended their Complaint  
 25 to assert approximately 1,400 additional works they allege were infringed, ECF Nos. 95 & 95-1,  
 26 and the parties briefed motions to dismiss, which were not resolved until mid-May 2024. ECF No.  
 27 102. Finally, the parties took part in a mediation in late September 2024, but ultimately did not  
 28 reach agreement. ECF No. 115 at 7.

1        After the conclusion of the mediation, the parties turned to discovery in earnest.  
 2 Defendants made their first document production on September 20, with four additional  
 3 productions on October 18 and October 21. Stillman Decl. ¶ 1. To date, Defendants have  
 4 produced over 1,300 documents totaling 11,496 pages, *id.* ¶ 2, including information about the 78  
 5 rpm records that have been digitized and catalogued, photos and documents describing the  
 6 cataloguing and digitization process, and internal meeting minutes and social media posts  
 7 regarding the Great 78 Project. Plaintiffs made their first and only document production on  
 8 November 4, comprising 123 documents totaling 383 pages—amounting to a haphazard collection  
 9 of documents related to a small handful of the asserted works along with publicly available  
 10 documents about or by Defendants, seemingly collected without rhyme or reason but rather for the  
 11 purpose of having produced “something” before filing this motion. *Id.* ¶ 3.

### 12     **III.    LEGAL STANDARD**

13        “A district court is vested with broad discretion to permit or deny discovery.” *Laub v. U.S. Dep’t of Interior*, 342 F.3d 1080, 1093 (9th Cir. 2003). Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(1) permits parties to “obtain discovery regarding any nonprivileged matter that is relevant to any party’s claim or defense and proportional to the needs of the case.” “Evidence is relevant if: (a) it has any tendency to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without the evidence; and (b) the fact is of consequence in determining the action.” Fed. R. Evid. 401. When determining whether particular evidence is proportional, the court must “consider[] the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in controversy, the parties’ relative access to relevant information, the parties’ resources, the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues, and whether the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1).

14        “The party seeking to compel discovery has the burden of establishing that its request satisfies the relevancy requirements of Rule 26(b)(1).” *La. Pac. Corp. v. Money Mkt. I Institutional Inv. Dealer*, 285 F.R.D. 481, 485 (N.D. Cal. 2012) (citing *Soto v. City of Concord*, 162 F.R.D. 603, 610 (N.D. Cal. 1995)). If a party fails to meet that burden, and the court determines that a party’s “proposed discovery is outside the scope permitted by Rule 26(b)(1),” “the court *must limit* the . . . extent of discovery.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(C) (emphasis added).

1     **IV. ARGUMENT**

2                 Plaintiffs seek to compel discovery or responses regarding four categories of evidence.  
 3 They have failed to meet their burden as to any of these categories, and the Court should deny their  
 4 motion.

5                 **A. PLAINTIFFS FAIL TO JUSTIFY DISCLOSURE OF KAHLE AND**  
 6                 **BLOOD'S PRIVATE AND HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL FINANCIAL**  
 7                 **INFORMATION**

8                 Plaintiffs have requested “[d]ocuments sufficient to show” Defendants Kahle and Blood’s  
 9 “assets, liabilities, and annual income, including IRS filings.” Mot. 4 (citation omitted). Plaintiffs  
 10 argue that “Kahle and Blood must produce documents showing their financial condition because  
 11 that information is relevant to statutory damages,” because one factor courts assess when setting  
 12 the level of a statutory damages award is the need for “deterrence.” Mot. 8. Plaintiffs assert that  
 13 “Kahle’s and Blood’s total assets, debts, and income is directly relevant to assessing the need for  
 14 deterrence and punishment for the straightforward reason that, the wealthier the defendant is, the  
 15 greater the sanction must be to have a deterrent and punitive effect.” Mot. 8. But Plaintiffs’  
 16 argument is flawed.

17                 As an initial matter, it is common sense that an individual’s personal financial information  
 18 is distinctly private and disclosure of such information is highly invasive. *See, e.g., Richmond v.*  
 19 *Mission Bank*, 2015 WL 1637835, at \*4 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 13, 2015) (“[I]t is indisputable that the  
 20 disclosure of ‘details regarding one’s personal finances or other financial information’ is a serious  
 21 invasion of privacy.” (citation omitted)). Indeed, California law explicitly recognizes individuals’  
 22 privacy interests in this kind of information—a privacy right that courts routinely weigh against  
 23 the need for disclosure in a given case. *See, e.g., Beautiful Slides, Inc. v. Allen*, 2017 WL  
 24 11664920, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 15, 2017) (denying motion to compel documents regarding  
 25 defendant’s compensation and remarking that “the court is mindful of [the defendant]’s right to  
 26 privacy under the California Constitution” (citing Cal. Const. art. I, § 1)); *RePet, Inc. v. Zhao*, 2016  
 27 WL 11634744, at \*5 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 3, 2016) (noting that California “right [to privacy] ‘extends  
 28 to financial privacy in litigation, but is subject to balancing the needs of the litigation with the

1 sensitivity of the information/records sought” (citation and alteration omitted)).<sup>1</sup> And other  
 2 doctrines, like the “public policy against unnecessary public disclosure” of tax returns, are  
 3 animated by similar principles. *Premium Serv. Corp. v. Sperry & Hutchinson Co.*, 511 F.2d 225,  
 4 229 (9th Cir. 1975); *see also S.F. Bay Area Rapid Transit Dist. v. Spencer*, 2006 WL 3050860, at  
 5 \*1 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 23, 2006); *cf. Palacios v. Ameriwood Indus., Inc.*, 2015 WL 7852167, at \*3–4  
 6 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 4, 2015) (discussing California tax return privilege).

7 Given the highly personal and private nature of an individual’s financial information,  
 8 Plaintiffs bear a heavy burden to justify their need for Kahle and Blood’s “assets, liabilities, and  
 9 annual income, including IRS filings.” Mot. 4. But Plaintiffs’ argument for the relevance of this  
 10 information is limited to a single topic: one factor (of a multifactor test) used in calculating the  
 11 level at which statutory damages should be set. Whether the Court will even need to award  
 12 statutory damages using that multifactor test at all rests on a host of contingencies occurring. For  
 13 example, (1) Plaintiffs must prove liability, including their ownership of every copyright asserted;  
 14 (2) they must be able to demonstrate their claims are not time-barred under the statute of limitations  
 15 (even though most of Defendants’ actions occurred more than three years before Plaintiffs filed  
 16 suit, and they were well aware of the Great 78 Project’s activities before that date), 17 U.S.C.  
 17 § 507(b); (3) they must overcome Defendants’ fair use defense (and other defenses); and (4) they  
 18 must overcome Defendants’ reliance on the library and archive exception, which immunizes  
 19 Defendants from liability, 17 U.S.C. § 108(h). And even if Plaintiffs are able to overcome all of  
 20 those hurdles, the statutory damages factors *still* may not be relevant if the Court concludes either  
 21 (1) that Defendants are entitled to complete remittitur of statutory damages under 17 U.S.C.  
 22 § 504(c)(2) because they “believed and had reasonable grounds for believing that [their] use of the  
 23 copyrighted work[s] was a fair use,” or (2) that Plaintiffs’ statutory damages are capped at \$200  
 24  
 25

---

26 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs assert that because “George Blood is a resident of Pennsylvania, [he] is presumably not  
 27 entitled to invoke the protections of the California Constitution as a bulwark against discovery.”  
 28 Mot. 10 n.3. But this argument misses the mark. Defendants’ point is that the policies that animate  
 California’s privacy protections for individual financial information weigh heavily against  
 disclosure of this information, both for Kahle and for Blood, as a matter of federal law. *See, e.g.,*  
*Beautiful Slides*, 2017 WL 11664920, at \*3.

1 per work because any infringement was “innocent,” *id.* In either case, there would be no occasion  
 2 to analyze the deterrence, because that factor would be irrelevant to setting statutory damages.

3 As this discussion illustrates, it is far from certain that any factfinder will ever need to  
 4 analyze the only issue Kahle and Blood’s finances are relevant to—the deterrence statutory  
 5 damages factor. And even if the factfinder did analyze that issue, it would not do so until a very  
 6 late stage of the case, and even then the evidence would play a relatively small role as one piece  
 7 of a multifactor test. When those facts are weighed against the very significant privacy concerns  
 8 implicated by the proposed disclosure of Kahle and Blood’s personal financial information, it is  
 9 clear that Plaintiffs cannot demonstrate a compelling need for this information *now* that outweighs  
 10 Kahle and Blood’s interests in protecting this information from disclosure at this early stage of the  
 11 case. To the extent that, as this case progresses, the calculus changes—for example, if the Court  
 12 resolves some of the legal issues noted above such that it is more likely than not that the factfinder  
 13 will be required to resolve statutory damages—the parties can revisit this issue. But at this  
 14 juncture, Plaintiffs’ request is, at a minimum, premature.

15 Plaintiffs resist that conclusion, and argue that “Defendants recognize that discovery into  
 16 their financials is appropriate” because “the corporate defendants—Defendants Internet Archive,  
 17 George Blood L.P., and Kahle-Austin Foundation—have all agreed to produce documents  
 18 showing their financial condition.” Mot. 9. As an initial matter, that these other Defendants agreed  
 19 to produce such documents as an accommodation to Plaintiffs does not constitute a recognition  
 20 that “discovery into their financials is appropriate.” *See, e.g.*, Stillman Decl. Ex. A (Internet  
 21 Archive’s Responses and Objections to Plaintiffs’ First Set of Requests for Production) at 31  
 22 (objecting to such requests on relevance and other grounds). More importantly, however, it is  
 23 common sense that an individual’s privacy rights are different in kind—and significantly greater—  
 24 than those of a corporate entity. Courts widely acknowledge this fact. *See, e.g.*, *Fleck & Assocs., Inc. v. Phoenix*, 471 F.3d 1100, 1104 (9th Cir. 2006) (“[C]orporations can claim no equality with  
 25 individuals in the enjoyment of a right to privacy.”); *EFT Holdings, Inc. v. CTX Virtual Techs., Inc.*, 2016 WL 11519280, at \*3 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 3, 2016) (explaining “an entity will have less  
 26 privacy rights than an individual”); *Saca v. J.P. Molyneux Studio Ltd.*, 2008 WL 62181, at \*4 (E.D.  
 27

1 Cal. Jan. 4, 2008) (noting privacy “rights [of business entities] are much less robust than those  
 2 enjoyed by individuals”). For that reason, it is unremarkable that an individual defendant’s privacy  
 3 rights could outweigh the need for disclosure, even where a corporate defendant’s may not. And  
 4 this point distinguishes Plaintiffs’ citation to *Jones v. Amicizia Events, Inc.*, 2020 WL 6065927, at  
 5 \*3 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2020), which involved disclosure of a *corporate* defendant’s “gross  
 6 revenues”—not an *individual*’s “assets, liabilities, and annual income, including IRS filings,” Mot.  
 7 4. For all these reasons, Plaintiffs’ motion to compel disclosure of Kahle and Blood’s finances  
 8 should be denied.

9                   **B. PLAINTIFFS’ REQUEST FOR GENERAL STATEMENTS ABOUT**  
 10                   **COPYRIGHT LAW SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT IS OVERBROAD**  
 11                   **AND SUCH STATEMENTS ARE IRRELEVANT**

12         This case is a copyright dispute about Defendants’ attempts to preserve for future  
 13 generations the unique experience of listening to 78 rpm music records. Given the subject matter  
 14 of this case, Defendants have agreed in response to Plaintiffs’ discovery request “to identify past  
 15 public statements that [Internet Archive or GBLP] have made regarding *music* copyrights that are  
 16 located pursuant to a reasonable search.” Mot. 5. Plaintiffs protest that the limitation of responses  
 17 to *music* copyrights is inappropriate, and argue that the Court should compel Defendants to  
 18 disclose a list of “[*a*]ll public statements” made by any Internet Archive or GBLP employee about  
 19 “copyright or the Copyright Act” generally. Mot. 5. But Plaintiffs are wrong—their request is  
 20 overbroad on its face and seeks information that is untethered to the claims and defenses at issue.  
 21 By contrast, Defendants’ response is appropriately tailored to the relevant issues the factfinder  
 22 must ultimately resolve.

23         On its face, Plaintiffs’ request is breathtakingly broad. It encompasses *all* public statements  
 24 made by *any* Internet Archive or GBLP employee about the subject of copyright or the Copyright  
 25 Act generally. Taken at face value, their request captures any public statements made, for example,  
 26 about copyright protection for semiconductor chip products, *see* 17 U.S.C. §§ 901–14, an  
 27 undeniably irrelevant topic in the context of this suit alleging infringement of specific sound  
 28 recordings. Given the radical overbreadth of Plaintiffs’ request, the Court should deny this aspect

1 of Plaintiffs' motion for that reason alone. Indeed, courts in this district routinely deny similar  
 2 requests for such expansive discovery. *See, e.g., Cook v. Meta Platforms, Inc.*, 2024 WL 1483992,  
 3 at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 5, 2024) (finding overbroad, irrelevant, and disproportional, a RFP asking  
 4 about allegations of "all counterfeiting," where the litigation concerned only "counterfeit sales  
 5 accomplished by using the legitimate seller's copyrighted works"); *Hudson Martin Ferrante St.  
 6 Witten & Demaria, PC v. Forsythe*, 2017 WL 550242, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 10, 2017) (finding  
 7 plaintiff's request for "copies of entire devices" overbroad for "fail[ing] to limit its requests to  
 8 discovery of information that may be relevant to the possession of QuickBooks data," the  
 9 information at issue).

10 Moreover, Plaintiffs are unable to explain why statements about copyright generally are  
 11 relevant to their claims. Plaintiffs argue that discovery about such statements would be probative  
 12 of Defendants' alleged willful infringement of Plaintiffs' music copyrights and the need for  
 13 deterrence. *See Mot.* 12–13. But these assertions are belied by Plaintiffs' own arguments, which  
 14 implicitly concede that the relevant inquiry is about Defendants' alleged infringement of Plaintiffs'  
 15 *sound recordings*. Plaintiffs contend, for example, that such statements bear on Defendants'  
 16 knowledge that "their infringement of Plaintiffs' protected *sound recordings* was illegal" and their  
 17 "conscious decision to disregard [copyright] principles *in the context of the Great 78 Project*."  
 18 Mot. 12–13 (emphasis added). In other words, even as framed by Plaintiffs, this dispute concerns  
 19 only music copyright, not copyright law generally. And Defendants have already agreed to  
 20 produce responsive statements that are relevant to *that* topic. At bottom, Plaintiffs are unable to  
 21 articulate any reason why Defendants' response is insufficient; that is, to explain what additional  
 22 value statements about non-music copyright would add. That is because they would not.<sup>2</sup>

23

---

25 <sup>2</sup> It is somewhat bizarre that the example Plaintiffs cite as purportedly demonstrating the  
 26 hypothetical relevance of what they are hoping to find is an interview in which Defendant Kahle  
 27 is quoted as (perhaps inartfully) explaining that he is trying to do the right thing and avoid upsetting  
 28 rightsholders. Which, again, is consistent with the history in this case: in response to the RIAA  
 letter over three years before the suit was filed, Kahle offered to take down any works that Plaintiffs  
 identified. *See* Miller Decl. Ex. 5 (ECF No. 128-5). He received no response at all. *See* Defs.'  
 Internet Archive, Kahle, Blood, and GBLP's Mot. to Dismiss (ECF No. 75) at 7; *see also* Gass  
 Decl. Exs. A (ECF No. 75-2) & B (ECF No. 75-3).

1           Finally, it bears emphasis that Plaintiffs' request seeks "[a]ll *public* statements." Mot. 5  
 2 (emphasis added). By definition, these "public" statements are equally available to Plaintiffs as to  
 3 Defendants. *Cf.* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2) (enumerating "the parties' relative access to relevant  
 4 information"). Internet Archive and GBLP have no special or internal methods to search for these  
 5 statements and, like Plaintiffs, would have to conduct searches of public databases. Put another  
 6 way, this is not information uniquely in Defendants' possession; nothing is stopping Plaintiffs  
 7 from obtaining this information themselves.

8           **C. PLAINTIFFS' REQUEST FOR ALL DIGITIZED SOUND RECORDINGS  
 9           SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT IS OVERBROAD AND  
 10          UNTETHERED TO THE SCOPE OF THE ALLEGED INFRINGEMENT  
 11          AT ISSUE HERE**

12           Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint identifies 4,142 sound recordings that Plaintiffs allege  
 13 Defendants infringed by digitizing and uploading for public streaming through the Great 78  
 14 Project. *See* ECF No. 95-1. Despite the Complaint's focus on the public performance or  
 15 distribution of these approximately four thousand asserted works-in-suit, Plaintiffs seek to compel  
 16 Defendants "to identify *all* sound recordings that [Internet Archive] ha[s] digitized as part of the  
 17 Great 78 Project but *do[es] not publicly perform or distribute to the general public.*" Mot. 5  
 18 (emphasis added). Plaintiffs argue that information about "[t]he identities and volume" of these  
 19 unasserted, unperformed, and undistributed works is relevant to Internet Archive's knowledge of  
 20 "its legal obligations with regard to Plaintiffs' works" and "good faith." Mot. 14–15. But they  
 21 fail to explain how "[t]he identities and volumes" of works that Plaintiffs *do not allege* infringe  
 22 Plaintiffs' copyrights could convey any relevant information about Internet Archive's knowledge  
 23 or willfulness as to the alleged infringement. Rather, Plaintiffs' request is transparently nothing  
 24 more than a fishing expedition, with the goal of identifying additional works that Plaintiffs can  
 25 then try to allege were infringed.

26           A copyright infringement claim is work-specific, meaning that a plaintiff bears the burden  
 27 of establishing infringement as to every work on which she chooses to sue. *See, e.g., Feist Publ'n's,*  
 28 *Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co.*, 499 U.S. 340, 361 (1991) ("To establish infringement, two elements

1 must be proven: (1) ownership of a valid copyright, and (2) copying of constituent elements *of the*  
 2 *work* that are original.” (emphasis added)). For that reason, the evidence that is relevant to  
 3 establishing a plaintiff’s claim is evidence related to the *asserted* copyrighted work—that is, the  
 4 specific works that the plaintiff has identified in her complaint. Evidence related to any *unasserted*  
 5 works, on the other hand, is irrelevant to establishing the plaintiff’s claim. Here, then, the only  
 6 evidence that is relevant to Plaintiffs’ claims is evidence related to the *asserted works* listed in  
 7 Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint. For that reason, their request for evidence related to the  
 8 digitization of old 78 rpm records donated to the Internet Archive from private collections and  
 9 libraries that have never been publicly available, and that Plaintiffs have not asserted infringe their  
 10 copyrights (indeed, for which Plaintiffs have not even suggested they *own* a relevant copyright)  
 11 should be denied.

12 Courts have repeatedly rejected similar attempts by plaintiffs to obtain discovery regarding  
 13 unasserted works. And for good reason: such requests are nothing more than fishing expeditions  
 14 to gin up additional works over which to sue—rather than the proper exercise of developing  
 15 evidence to prove the claims that the plaintiff had a Rule 11 basis to assert in the first place. *See,*  
 16 *e.g., Epidemic Sound AB v. Meta Platforms, Inc.*, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 185597, at \*3 (N.D. Cal.  
 17 Oct. 10, 2024) (refusing to compel the production of documents related to works not at issue);  
 18 *Teradyne, Inc. v. Astronics Test Sys., Inc.*, 2022 WL 18397125, at \*6 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2022)  
 19 (explaining that a request for “evidence of potential copyright infringement not currently at issue”  
 20 is “a fishing expedition for new causes of action” and “would impose a fairly heavy burden”);  
 21 *Psihogios v. Pearson Educ., Inc.*, 2010 WL 11889066, at \*1 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 7, 2010) (finding  
 22 plaintiffs’ request for information concerning unpledaded works “grossly overbroad,” and  
 23 explaining that “discovery ‘is not intended to be a fishing expedition, but rather is meant to allow  
 24 the parties to flesh out allegations for which they initially have at least a modicum of objective  
 25 support”” (citation omitted)); *Slate v. Am. Broad. Cos.*, 274 F.R.D. 350, 352 (D.D.C. 2011)  
 26 (limiting discovery to the infringement alleged within “the four corners of the Complaint” and  
 27 rejecting plaintiff’s argument that evidence of other copyright infringement “could, conceivably,  
 28

1 establish a pattern and practice of copyright infringement").<sup>3</sup> Allowing discovery that is not  
 2 tethered to the works in suit turns the discovery process on its head and gets it exactly backwards.  
 3 Plaintiffs' request should be rejected.

4       **D. PLAINTIFFS' REQUEST ABOUT UNLOCKED RECORDINGS IS**  
 5       **MERITLESS AND AT BEST PREMATURE**

6 Plaintiffs' Interrogatory No. 8 to Internet Archive requested that Internet Archive  
 7 "[i]dentify all persons, including current and former employees, with responsibility for the  
 8 Unlocked Recordings section of the Internet Archive website." Mot. 6. Subject to several  
 9 objections (for example, about the relevance of the Unlocked Recordings to Plaintiffs' claims),  
 10 Internet Archive responded to Plaintiffs' interrogatory and identified Brewster Kahle as the  
 11 individual with relevant responsibility. Mot. 6. In subsequent meet and confers, Internet Archive  
 12 informed Plaintiffs that its investigation was ongoing and that it would supplement its response to  
 13 this Interrogatory if appropriate based on that investigation. Mot. 6. To date, Internet Archive's  
 14 investigation has not resulted in any information to supplement this response.

15 Apparently dissatisfied with that response, Plaintiffs have moved to compel Internet  
 16 Archive to "conduct a proper investigation" and "supplement [this] interrogatory response." Mot.  
 17 15. Plaintiffs' motion is premature, and assumes Internet Archive's bad faith. Plaintiffs suggest  
 18 that Internet Archive must have failed to undertake a proper investigation because it had "nearly a  
 19 year to investigate and respond to Plaintiffs' repeated requests to respond fully to this  
 20 interrogatory." Mot. 15. The implication that Internet Archive is delaying or acting in bad faith  
 21 with respect to investigating this response simply because Plaintiffs disagree with the substantive  
 22 response Internet Archive has provided is not well taken. To the contrary, Defendants have been  
 23 diligently carrying out their investigation and discovery obligations. For example, Defendants

---

24

25       <sup>3</sup> Nor does a generic, default deadline by which to move to amend a pleading suggest otherwise.  
 26 In a copyright case, a plaintiff's claim is analyzed work-by-work. For that reason, each new work  
 27 asserted is essentially a claim unto itself, requiring proof of all the elements of copyright  
 28 infringement as to each individual work. As a corollary, each new work asserted requires access  
          to extensive discovery, like the plaintiff's ownership and the facts surrounding fair use as to each  
          individual work. The potential prejudice from "[a] need to reopen discovery and therefore delay  
          the proceedings" is obvious. *Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Network Sols.*, 194 F.3d 980, 986 (9th Cir.  
          1999).

1 have made five separate productions, comprising over 1,300 documents totaling 11,496 pages.  
 2 And Defendants have already supplemented their responses to multiple interrogatories based on  
 3 their ongoing investigation. *See supra* at 5. Moreover, Defendants have been shouldering these  
 4 responsibilities in the face of significant logistical challenges as a result of a major cyberattack  
 5 (widely covered in the media) that has impaired numerous Internet Archive functions.<sup>4</sup> If  
 6 Defendants' ongoing investigation reveals additional information, Internet Archive will  
 7 supplement its response to Plaintiffs' Interrogatory, as appropriate.

8 Plaintiffs protest that "Internet Archive has not conducted even the most basic of  
 9 investigations to respond to this interrogatory." Mot. 16. The only evidence Plaintiffs point to in  
 10 support of this assertion is that "[t]he Unlocked Recordings homepage states that the Unlocked  
 11 Recordings collection was created on Oct. 24, 2018 by 'ARossi,'" which Plaintiffs conclude is a  
 12 reference to "Alexis Rossi, the Director of Media & Access at Internet Archive," and who Plaintiffs  
 13 speculate should have been identified as a person "responsible" for the Unlocked Recordings in  
 14 response to Interrogatory 8. Mot. 15–16. But Internet Archive has investigated Plaintiffs' request,  
 15 and based on its investigation to date, Internet Archive has concluded that Rossi was not  
 16 "responsible" for the Unlocked Recordings. And Plaintiffs do not provide any reason to conclude  
 17 otherwise. The fact that the website listed her name six years ago does not mean that she is actually  
 18 responsive to Plaintiffs' Interrogatory. In any event, if Internet Archive's ongoing investigation  
 19 ultimately suggests that she was, in fact, "responsible" for the Unlocked Recordings in a relevant  
 20 sense, then Internet Archive will supplement its response. And Plaintiffs are free to ask about  
 21 Rossi in depositions, as they clearly already have information about her and the Unlocked  
 22 Recordings.

23

24

---

25 <sup>4</sup> See Tom Warren, *The Internet Archive Is Back as a Read-Only Service After Cyberattacks*, Verge  
 26 (Oct. 14, 2024), [https://www.theverge.com/2024/10/14/24269741/internet-archive-online-read-](https://www.theverge.com/2024/10/14/24269741/internet-archive-online-read-only-data-breach-outage)  
 27 [only-data-breach-outage](https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2024/10/18/internet-archive-hack-wayback/); Daniel Wu, *The World's Largest Internet Archive Is Under Siege—And Fighting Back*, Wash. Post (Oct. 18, 2024),  
 28 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2024/10/18/internet-archive-hack-wayback/>; Chris  
 Freeland, *Internet Archive Services Update: 2024-10-21*, Internet Archive (Oct. 21, 2024),  
<https://blog.archive.org/2024/10/21/internet-archive-services-update-2024-10-21/> (noting that  
many Internet Archive "services will have limited availability as we continue maintenance").

1           In sum, Internet Archive is taking its discovery obligations seriously and is complying with  
 2 those obligations in good faith. Plaintiffs' dissatisfaction or impatience with Internet Archive's  
 3 answers is not a sufficient ground for a motion to compel. Their motion should be denied.

4           **V. CONCLUSION**

5           For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs' motion to compel should be denied.

6           Dated: November 20, 2024

7           Respectfully submitted,

8           **LATHAM & WATKINS LLP**

9           /s/ Allison L. Stillman

10           Andrew M. Gass (Bar No. 259694)

11           *andrew.gass@lw.com*

12           Joseph R. Wetzel (Bar No. 238008)

13           *joe.wetzel@lw.com*

14           505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000

15           San Francisco, CA 94111

16           (415) 391-0600

17           Allison L. Stillman (*pro hac vice*)

18           *allie.stillman@lw.com*

19           1271 Avenue of the Americas

20           New York, NY 10020

21           (212) 906-1200

22           Brent T. Murphy (*pro hac vice*)

23           *brent.murphy@lw.com*

24           Chinyere Amanze (*pro hac vice pending*)

25           *chinyere.amanze@lw.com*

26           555 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 1000

27           Washington, DC 20004

28           (202) 637-2200

29           *Attorneys for Defendants Internet Archive,  
 30 Brewster Kahle, Kahle/Austin Foundation,  
 George Blood, and George Blood L.P.*